Much in a Little:

OR,

An Abstract of Mr. *Baxters* plain Scripture-Proof for

INFANTS Church-Membership

OR

BAPTISM.

With a few Notes upon the Anti-queries of *T. G.* By the same hand that wrote the Fifty Queries.

LONDON

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst* at the Bible and three Crowns the lower end of *Cheapside* near *Mercers-Chappel.* 1678.

[illegible]

Reader,

WHat Artifices and aſſaults the Devil hath made and uſed to ſupplant the weightieſt Principles, to darken the moſt clear and comfortable Truths, and to break the Peace and Concord of the Church, is grown too evident to require proof. And how he hath perplexed this preſent Doctrine of the Church-Membership, and Baptiſm of Infants, *with Controverſies, we need not now inſiſt upon. But ſurely, were not our little ones as well concerned and intereſted in the Covenant of Grace, as their Parents are, your ſtrange and deep compaſſions towards them (ſo rooted in Nature, and cultivated and enlarged by Grace) would become their dreadful torment and diſtreſs. And why Infants ſhould feel the ſmart and dreadful puniſhments of the violated Law or Covenant of innocent nature, (as is evident in their early diſeaſes, pains and death) and not be capable of redreſs and pardon by a gracious Covenant, I am yet to learn. And what their capacity ſhould be for, if not to be anſwerably treated and regarded, (ſuppoſing what God by his Son and in his Goſpel hath prepared and tendred to us), I cannot underſtand. All Laws conſider Infants as in their Parents, until maturity make them*

capable of chusing and acting for themselves. And why we should exclude them from Covenant redresses, seeing God once took them in by an Act or Law of Grace not yet repealed, I am not able to conjecture. Were they excluded from Gospel-Church, their Parents would want, 1. That Cogent Argument which now they have to be devoted unto God themselves, and to be true to such a Dedication, as ever they regard the present and eternal welfare of their Infant-Seed. And 2. A Soveraign Antidote against their griefs and fears, when their children are removed in their Infancy. For if God hath no-where promised to save our little ones by his Son, to pardon them, and to adopt them into his Family, what can perswade us, that they belong not to the Devil, and that they are not gone to dwell with him when they are dead? And then with what dejected hearts and looks must mourning Parents follow their deceased Infants to their Graves! But I shall (and need) not say any more, seeing this Abstract of Mr. Baxters *larger and elaborate Treatise, comes on this Errand to its Reader, who is desired to take notice, that it was ready many Months agone, soon after the publication of the Anti-Queries, though its own publication hath been obstructed until now. Peruse, and judge impartially.*

A few Notes upon the Queriſt Examined.

YOur *Anti-Queries*, very lately ſent me by one of your party, as [*A full Anſwer to the Fifty Queries,*] I have conſidered impartially, I hope; and cannot think them worthy of a Book in Anſwer: Yet that you might not take my *Silence* either for *conſent*, or for a contempt, I have written theſe few pages here.

Now in the firſt place I muſt tell you, Thoſe *Fifty Queries* will remain unanſwered, until that Book of Mr. *Baxters* be anſwered, to which every *Query* refers, which, for ought I know, you never yet lookt into. * And whether your *Anti-Queries*, ſo far as they concern the main point in Queſtion, be not cut off, and anſwered again and again in that Book, and divers other extant, and common, I leave to the judgment of indifferent Readers.

* In your Title page you ſay, *Fifty Queries gathered out of the Works of Mr. Rich. Baxter.*

Further I might tell you of your playing upon the word, [*Church,*] *Antiq.* 1. *p.* 1. which is immediately explained in my first Query, by *Kingdom of God*, which prevents your exception. And I might take notice of your new-covn'd Term, [*Practical Ordinance,*] which you have so often, as if there were some other Ordinances, *speculative*, or not practical. I might take notice of your *Illogical* distinction, of being a Member of the Church *Essentially*, and being a Member *Formally*, *Anti*. 18. *p.* 14. And your not allowing an universal *Visible* Church, *Antiq.* 16. *p.* 12. I might take notice how you misunderstand, or misapply those Texts, *Except ye eat the Flesh of*---- (*Joh.* 6. 53.) And, *Except a man be born of water*---- (*Joh.* 3. 5.) As if the former spake of the Lords Supper, and the latter of Baptism, (*vid. Antiq. p.* 5.) Again, I might take notice of your *shooting short*, in many of your *Antiqueries*. As becaufe there was a time when Infants within the Church were not devoted to God by any such *engaging sign*, as Circumcision, or Baptism, no such *engaging sign* being then institu-

inſtituted; therefore Infants are not to be ſo ſolemnly devoted to God, when ſuch an engaging ſin is inſtituted, and belongeth to all within the Church. And your *ſhooting wide* is plain in ſome others. I might tell you, how you have the ſame things over and over again. Though you accuſe me of *continual tautologizing*, *Antiq.* 38. *p.* 30. I am willing, the Impartial Reader ſhould judge, whether of us be moſt guilty here. *Turpe eſt Doctori*, &c. I take notice of your citing Mr. *Baxters Cure of Church-Diviſions*, *p.* 7. no leſs than thrice, (*ſcil.* in Preface, and *p.* 10. and *p.* 32.) yet a man may turn thrice to *p.* 7. in that book of Mr. *Baxter* for that which you refer unto, and loſe his labour. So I take notice of your vain flouriſhing, and braving it with Mr. *T's confident challenge*, both in the end of your Preface, [*And know this*, &c.] and again, *Antiq.* 49 *p.* 38, 39. (when alſo you *ſhoot wide*, not one word to my Query.) As concerning Mr. *Baxter*, I may ſay, *Know this*, that others that are ſober and judicious, *tell him*, he hath clear'd thoſe points ſufficiently, that any *further debate*

concerning them is *needleſs*. Further I might take notice of the many [*Et cætera's*] you have put to my *Queries*, ſometimes leaving out what was moſt likely to pinch; yea, you cut off the *cwief part* of fiftieth and *laſt Query*, without ſo much as an *&c.* unleſs it was the Printers fault. Again, I might take notice where you are not very conſiſtent with, but rather contradict your ſelf One or two places I may have occaſion to obſerve.

But I muſt take notice of your fair *conceſſions*, and I thank you for them. I will not diſpute it with you, whether theſe of yours be properly called, *Anti-queries?* Let the *prepoſition* Ἀντὶ be either *pro* or *con*, with you, I ſhould not ſpend time in criticiſing on the word. But whether *in compoſition*, the *word* of an Apoſtle or Meſſenger of the Churches, (as I have heard, ſome do call you) ſhould be both *yea* and *nay*, may be a queſtion.

Now, what do theſe following Queries o yours imply, [*Antiq. 5. p. 4. Whether the Baptiſts do not as clearly aſſert Infants right to the grace of God in the firſt Edition of the Covenant made with*

Adam

Adam *as any what ſoever?* Antiq. 10. p. 9. *As for the gracious Covenant made with* Adam, *do we not grant that it extends to Infants? yea, we ſay with Mr.* Baxter, *it was never abrogated.* Antiq 19. p. 14. *Whether the Bleſſing of* Abraham (*if you underſtand it of Eternal Life*) *was not the Bleſſing of the Fathers that were before him? And whether that Bleſſing did not belong to their Infants?* (which is not at all oppoſite to my 19 Query. And in what follows there, you plainly *ſhoot ſhort*, as I noted before.) And *Antiq.* 23. *p.* 17. you fairly grant, that *Promiſes* made to the *Seed of the Righteous*, to the children of them that Love God, *&c.* are unrevoked, you doubt not but *theſe Promiſes yet remain.* (Though I confeſs, I do not well underſtand what you mean by thoſe words, *Antiq.* 21. *p.* 16. *Whether all men that follow the rules of Morality, are not within the reach of theſe Bleſſings alſo?* Theſe you ſpeak of, are either *Righteous*, and ſuch as *love God*, or they are not. If they be *ſuch*, then certainly they belong to the Univerſal Church, and are real *Members* of it; if they are not *ſuch*, then they have not an intereſt in

the promiſe made to ſuch as *love God*, neither can they lay claim to Bleſſings promiſed.) But to go on with your conceſſions: *Antiq.* 11. *p.* 9. *And whether the difference between the Baptiſts and Pædobaptiſts, be not chiefly (if not only) about impoſing Ceremonies upon Infants?* Antiq. 12. p. 10. *Seeing the Baptiſts may and do in a good ſenſe acknowledge Infants to be related to the Church,* viz. *by Redemption, pious Dedication to God,* &c. Antiq. 30. p. 23. *And who denies Infants to be capable of Infant-Relation, Obligation, or Right? Or who oppoſeth their being devoted to God in their capacity?* Antiq. 31. p. 24. *Whether you do not greatly wrong your ſelf, and thoſe you call Anabaptiſts, in ſaying, they vehemently plead againſt devoting their Children to God? yea, ſure they do it actually, as far as Gods word requires.——Prove if you can, that you your ſelves do conſent to the Covenant of grace for your Infants, more than we, whom you call Anabaptiſts.*] Here we have (as you ſay in your *Preface*) your "*Conceſſions in reſpect of Infants Rela-*"*tion to God, by vertue of the Covenant* "*of Grace, and the Devotion of his peo-*"*ple,*

"*ple*, &c. I ſhall be very glad, if I may know you are all agreed in theſe things. And here (methinks) you offer as fair, as any of your way, I have ever met with to end our difference about *Infant-Baptiſm*. If the *premiſes* be granted, the *concluſion* will follow. If you grant our Infants within the Covenant, then they have right to the *inveſting ſign*. To whom the *promiſe* belongs, to them *Baptiſme* belongs, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. If you yield our Infants *Church-Members*, then you ſhould not deny their right to *ſolemn admiſſion* by Baptiſm. (See Mr. *Baxters* plain *Scripture-proof*, &c. *p.* 23. &c.) And Mr. *T.* your Champion, yielded, this would follow.

You grant, *Antiq.* 6. *p.* 4. and *Antiq.* 22. *p.* 16. That *Infants are of the Redeemed Church*. And in the cloſe of *Antiq.* 25. *p.* 19. That Infants *ſtill retain Member-ſhip in the Inviſible Church*. And *Antiq.* 16. *p.* 13. They are *Members of the Univerſal Church* (*inviſible*, you mean, for you like not of an *Univerſal Church Viſible*.) And otherwiſe (as you ſay) *How ſhall they be ſaved, ſeeing Chriſt is only the Saviour of his*

Body. Only I query whether it be not a contradiction, when you ſay, *Antiq.* 28. *p.* 21. *How can Infants be ſaid to be a ſpiritual Seed:* Are any but a ſpiritual Seed, Members of the Inviſible Church? Are not they a ſpiritual Seed that are of Chriſts Body, and ſaved by him?

But if Infants be not Members of the Viſible Church, how can you prove they are Members of the Inviſible Church? To be probably Members of the Inviſible Church, is to be Members of the Viſible Church, or Viſible Church-Members. Further, you ſay, *The Baptiſts do in a good ſenſe acknowledge Infants to be related to the Church,* viz. *by Redemption, pious Dedication to God, &c.* (*Antiq.* 12. *pag.* 10. before-cited) now do but make ſenſe of it, and I have enough. Either theſe Infants viſibly belong to the Kingdom of Chriſt, or to the Kingdom of Satan: (for theſe two Kingdoms divide and ſhare the whole world, that ſuch as are not of the one, are certainly of the other; and ſuch as are not viſibly of the one, are viſibly of the other) And will you ſay, that ſuch as are of the

Redeemed

Redeemed-Church, related to the Church by Redemption, and further related by *Pious Dedication to God*, &c. are viſibly the ſeed of the Serpent, and of the Kingdom of Satan.

But this [*Pious Dedication*] leads me to another of your ſelf-contradictions. *Anti-q.* 30. *p.* 23. *Where are Chriſtian Parents required to devote their children, by conſenting to any Covenant for them?* (Though you grant there, the *Jews* were required to Covenant for their children *in matters of Religion.*) And yet under the next *Anti-query*, *p.* 24. you ſay, *Prove if you can, that you your ſelves do conſent to the Covenant of grace for your Infants, more than we.* How properly may theſe be called *Anti-queries?* Or to get off, will you ſay, you *conſent* to the Covenant of grace for the Infants? but not as a *thing required?*

I gave you thanks before, for ſome things granted concerning Infants, and I here promiſe more thanks, if you will prove the ſame of *all Infants*. This you inſinuate, p. 5. *Seeing then all Infants (for ought you know) have the ſame right* — But I doubt, your proof of this point

Body. Only I query whether it be not a contradiction, when you ſay, *Antiq.* 28. *p.* 21. *How can Infants be ſaid to be a ſpiritual Seed:* Are any but a ſpiritual Seed, Members of the Inviſible Church? Are not they a ſpiritual Seed that are of Chriſts Body, and ſaved by him?

But if Infants be not Members of the Viſible Church, how can you prove they are Members of the Inviſible Church? To be probably Members of the Inviſible Church, is to be Members of the Viſible Church, or Viſible Church-Members. Further, you ſay, *The Baptiſts do in a good ſenſe acknowledge Infants to be related to the Church,* viz. *by Redemption, pious Dedication to God, &c.* (*Antiq.* 12. *pag.* 10. before-cited) now do but make ſenſe of it, and I have enough. Either theſe Infants viſibly belong to the Kingdom of Chriſt, or to the Kingdom of Satan: (for theſe two Kingdoms divide and ſhare the whole world, that ſuch as are not of the one, are certainly of the other; and ſuch as are not viſibly of the one, are viſibly of the other) And will you ſay, that ſuch as are of the

Redeemed

Redeemed Church, related to the Church by Redemption, and further related by *Pious Dedication to God*, &c. are visibly the ſeed of the Serpent, and of the Kingdom of Satan.

But this [*Pious Dedication*] leads me to another of your ſelf-contradictions. *Anti-q.* 30. *p.* 23. *Where are Chriſtian Parents required to devote their children, by conſenting to any Covenant for them?* (Though you grant there, the *Jews* were required to Covenant for their children *in matters of Religion.*) And yet under the next *Anti-query*, *p.* 24. you ſay, *Prove if you can, that you your ſelves do conſent to the Covenant of grace for your Infants, more than we.* How properly may theſe be called *Anti-queries?* Or to get off, will you ſay, you *conſent* to the Covenant of grace for the Infants? but not as a *thing required?*

I gave you thanks before, for ſome things granted concerning Infants, and I here promiſe more thanks, if you will prove the ſame of *all Infants.* This you inſinuate, p. 5. *Seeing then all Infants (for ought you know) have the ſame right* — But I doubt, your proof of this point

point will be as lame and weak, as your ſentence there is imperfect, and abrupt. You ſhould not wrong us, To ſay, *we reſtrain the love and grace of God to ſuch Infants as* (in your new phraſe) *partake with Parents in practicals of Religion*, (*Antiq.* 3. *p.* 2.) as if we held, that no Infant (dying unbaptized) could be ſaved, is a charge, you cannot prove. *Antiq.* 4. *p.* 3. *Whether the Parents conſent to wickedneſs is the childs conſent?*] Peruſe Mr. *Baxter of Original Sin.* You your ſelf do not deny, (*Antiq.* 7. *p.* 6.) *but the wickedneſs of Parents may expoſe their Infant-children to external calamities.* Yea, *Antiq.* 21. *p.* 16. *whoever doubted, but that Infants are---greatly diſadvantaged by the wickedneſs of their Parents, even ſo as to bear their Fathers iniquities many times, as is evident in the overthrow of the old World*, &c.) Now God is not injuſt in what he inflicts on ſuch children. If they bear the Fathers iniquities, they are ſome way guilty with their Parents.

You enquire further, *Antiq.* 4. *p.* 3. *And whether this do not give the Parents power to ſave, or damn their Infants?*]

But

But you will not ſay, I ſuppoſe, that you are your own Saviour, when you perform the condition of the Covenant, to which Salvation for Chriſts ſake is graciouſly promiſed. Neither will we ſay, that any Infants periſh purely for auothers ſin, or the Parents ſin *only imputed*; but for their *own contracted*. (As Mr. *Baxter of Original Sin*, p. 135.)

The overthrow of both thoſe Generations in the deluge, (ſpoken of *Gen.* 6.) is a ſtrange *Medium* to prove the Salvation of all their Infants, which you hint at, *Antiq.* 7. *p.* 6 And *Rom.* 5. 18. which you there cite, will no more prove, that all Infants (that die Infants) are ſaved; then that all men are ſaved. *The free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life.* This [*all*] muſt be limited to *all* in Chriſt.

Antiq. 22. *p.* 16. *Whether God hath not ſaid, that His ways are all equal? And whether this do not ſecure Infants of Gods mercy——when God ſaith, that the Son ſhall not bear the Iniquity of the Father, and every one ſhall bear his own Iniquity, whether this be not a promiſe of Mercy to Infant-children, and that in reſpect of Eternal Life?*] Here you imply,

ply, that Gods ways are not equal, if he ſhew not Mercy on all Infants, if he give not Eternal life unto all that die Infants. And if you take theſe words [*every one ſhall bear his own Iniquity*] to be a promiſe of Eternal life to all Infants, as ſuch; you muſt hold, that no Infant hath any iniquity to bear, and ſo wholly deny the doctrine of Original ſin, (which I perceive you do; though you will never be able to anſwer the Arguments, and Scripture-evidence brought to prove it.) But you miſapply the Scripture. What is ſpoken of the *Adult*, you apply to *Infants*, (a very common miſtake of thoſe of your way and perſwaſion.) In the 18. of *Ezek.* the Lord pleads with men that had too good a conceit of themſelves, and would caſt the blame on others, if they ſuffered, as if they themſelves were guiltleſs, *Verſ.* 2. *The Fathers have eaten ſour Grapes, and the childrens Teeth are ſet on edge.*] q. d. Our Fathers have ſinned, and we their children ſmart, and ſuffer for it. Now the Lord, to ſhew that his ways are equal, declares, that he that is righteous, ſhall live, *verſ.* 5. *&c.* But if ſuch

a one hath a Son that proves wicked, that Son ſhall die, *verſ.* 10. *&c.* Again, if the Son of a wicked man ſees, and abhors his Fathers wicked courſes, if he be righteous, he ſhall live, and ſhall not bear his Fathers iniquity, *v.*14. *&c.* yea, if a man have been never ſo wicked, yet if he repent, and turn, he ſhall ſurely live, *verſ.* 21. *&c.* But in all this there is no promiſe of Eternal life to all the Infant-ſeed of the wicked.

Anti. 37. *p.* 29. *And where are we taught to doubt the Salvation of the Infants of Pagans?*] Sometimes we are troubled at ſome of your way, that they ſeem to allow us no more ground of hope, concerning the Seed of the Faithful, then concerning the Seed of the Heathen and Pagans. But if it be ſo clear, that none are to doubt the Salvation of the Infants of Pagans, we ſhould reſt ſatisfied, and think it enough that the children of the faithful are put into ſo good a condition. But I told you (in my Treatiſe of the Covenants, *p.* 359.) That to aſſert the Salvation of all that die in Infancy, ſeems to imply, that Gods deſtroying the old world, and *Sodom*, *&c.* were eminent

Acts

Acts of Mercy, rather then of *Juſtice*; wherein ſuch multitude of Souls were ſent to Heaven together, who if they had lived, had probably (at leaſt the greateſt part of them) gone to Hell. I deſire you would remove this doubt of mine. So likewiſe I cannot yet reconcile your opinion with that Reaſon the Lord gives for his ſparing *Nineveh*, *Jonas* 4. 11. (which I alſo there took notice of.) Had there not been more Mercy, ſuppoſe the Lord had taken away above ſixſcore thouſand little ones, that were not come to the uſe of reaſon, if then they had all been undoubtedly ſaved; then in ſparing them with the City, whereupon probably not one of very many of them was ſaved. Help me over this doubt. And if the Salvation of Pagans-Infants is not to be doubted, (as you ſuggeſt) then ſuppoſe the *French King* ſhould have power to over-run all the *Pagan* countries in the world, though he ſpoiled, plundered, fired all the Towns where he came; yet provided he did but withal ſlay all their little ones, then will it not follow, that he might be looked upon as a greater Bleſſing than

Scourge

Scourge to the world? Had the world your light and knowledge, they muſt conclude, that they ought not to be ſo ſorry for the ſpoiling of their Countries, (a temporal calamity) as they ſhould rejoyce, (have cauſe of rejoycing indeed) that all their little ones were undoubtedly ſaved, certainly ſent to Heaven. And then what ſhall we make of *Eph.* 2. 3. *And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others?* And v. 12. *That all that time ye were without Chriſt, being aliens from the Common-wealth of* Iſrael, *and ſtrangers from the Covenants of Promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world. Having no hope.*] If there be no ground to doubt of the Salvation of their Infants? is not here ſome hope?

But have you not forgotten that you told us, you *do not doubt*, but the promiſes made to the Seed of the Righteous, and the promiſe of ſhewing mercy to the children of them that love God, *&c.* remain unrevoked? How are thoſe promiſes made to their Seed, *as ſuch*, if as great mercy be enſured, and ſecured, procured by the death

death of Christ, to and for all Infants that die Infants, (as you intimate *Antiq.* 37. p. 14. and in other places? And when you would have the *blessing of* Abraham *(understanding it of eternal life) to belong to the Infants of the Gentiles,* (as *Antiq.* 19. *p.* 14.) if you understand, and take in the Infants of the unbelieving, as well as believing Gentiles; then do not you forget that Expression, *Gal.* 3. 14. *That the blessing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles.* As to their Infants, you here suppose it to have been on them all along, and not to come on them, by their Parents *receiving the Promise through faith.* According to your opinion, all Infants are, and ever were blessed with faithful *Abraham*, notwithstanding many of the Parents have been, and are Pagans, Infidels, and such as the word Pronounces under a Curse. Now, how may divers of your own party (such as you call Baptists) justly object that to you, which without ground they are wont to object against us? you would *make the promise of Salvation run unto a fleshly line indeed*, (as Mr. *Baxter* notes in his *Review*, p. 33.) And

who

who can forbid water, (now that Baptism is the initiatory Sign and Seal of the Covenant) to any dying Infant of a Pagan, since he may be confident the Blessings of the Covenant belong to it?

You query *ubi supra*, (*Antiq.* 37. *p.* 29.) *Will not the second* Adams *obedience save the first* Adams *disobedience?* And *Antiq.* 38. *p.* 30. *Whether the meritoriousness of Christ is not as available to save Infants, without any mans acceptance thereof for them?*] I doubt not, but the second *Adams* obedience and merits are available, so far as was intended, and agreed betwixt the Father and him. But it lies on you to prove, that it was so intended and agreed, that all Infants, so dying, shall *absolutely* be saved.

Antiq. 37. p. 29. *Whether it be his will, that the grace of that Covenant should depend upon others observation of the condition for them? And whether this be not to put the Salvation of Infants out of his own hand?*] Infants are not saved by the Covenant of grace, which is [to Believers and their Seed;] if they neither be Believers, nor the Seed of

ſuch. Only that I be not miſunderſtood, I add, If any that enjoy not the Goſpel, that never heard that joyful ſound, come up to the terms of the Covenant of Grace made with *Adam* and *Noah*, I rank not them and their Seed with Infidels.

To what you ſay of Gods, [*putting the Salvation of Infants out of his own hand*:] I need ſay but this, you might as well query, whether God put not the Salvation of the Adult out of his own hand, if their Salvation be ſuſpended on performance of the condition required.

One thing more I cannot but obſerve, (wherein I ſuppoſe you are a little ſingular alſo) In *Antiq.* 26. *p.* 19. You make *your Impoſition of hands as generally pertaining to Members of the Church, as Baptiſm.* (Where I might note, that you ſeem to grant, Baptiſm generally pertains to the Members of the Church. (But that by the way.) Now elſewhere * you tell us, that [*In this holy Ordinance of Prayer and Impoſition of hands, we are in a ſolemn manner aſſured into the promiſe of the holy Spirit.*] You go on, [*Impoſition of*

* In Serm. on 1 *Cor.* 12.1.p.95.

of hands doth put us in a better capacity to ſeek daily for the gifts and graces of the Spirit; becauſe now ſolemnly intereſted in the promiſe, by that very way the primitive Saints were intereſted therein, Act. 8. 15, 17. Act. 19. 2, 6. 2 Tim. 1. 6. Heb. 6. 1, 2. ——*What ſhall I ſay? The Scriptures* (or, theſe Scriptures) *are evidence ſufficient, that this Ordinance is of Divine Inſtitution, is from Heaven; the promiſe which it leads to, is perpetual, and univerſal, it belongs to the whole body. There is one Body, and one Spirit,* &c. This is the concluſion of the Sermon, (*p.* 96, 97.) And what *gifts* of the Spirit you ſpeak of is very plain, throughout the Sermon. For brevity, I will mention but one place, (p. 77.) *Thus you ſee the Church being under perpetual Exhortations, to ſeek for ſpiritual gifts* [*without any reſtriction,*] *neceſſarily infers her perpetual right to them, and every of them; which conſideration alone is ſufficient (as I conceive) to ſatisfie any Chriſtian, that the promiſe of the Spirit* (*even the ſame that was given to the firſt Churches*) *in reſpect of gifts as well as graces, belongs to the Church of Chriſt throughout all Ages.*

Now if *Impoſition of hands generally pertains* to all the Members of the Church, and *ſolemnly intereſteth* them in the promiſe of the Spirit, methinks it ſhould follow, that all ſuch Members, on whom you lay your hands, (ſuppoſing you have *right* to do it, as you take up the practice, if I be not miſ-informed) ſhould have ſome *extraordinary gifts* of the Spirit. And I have reaſon to think, you encourage your followers to ſubmit to this *Impoſition*, by working in them ſuch a perſwaſion and expectation. For (*p.* 88. of the forecited Sermon) you have theſe words, *As the promiſe of gifts (as well as graces) [pertains to us as we are the called of God] we ought to ſtir one another up, to ſeek with all diligence, and [full aſſurance] for the Spirit of promiſe.* And p. 95. *'Tis well known (and I think granted on all hands) that they* (i. e. *the Primitive Churches*) *uſed the ſolemn Ordinance of Prayer and Impoſition of hands, for obtaining the promiſed Spirit, at leaſt with reſpect to theſe gifts.---Then ſeeing theſe gifts are promiſed to us as well as unto them, and are attainable, and in part (at leaſt) attained*

tained by many, what ſhould hinder the Churches, but that now they ſhould tread in this path, with faith, and [*full aſſurance*] *that a bleſſing is in it?* But while you call for full aſſurance here, I am full of doubt, that you have no ſuch Promiſe, nor Commiſſion for your practice [*of Impoſition of hands, for conferring the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.*] Take heed of pretending a *Commiſſion from Heaven*; take heed of counterfeiting Heavens *Seal.* Oh, be afraid of taking *Gods Name in vain.* Will you herein imitate the Apoſtles? May it not be ſaid of you, *You know not what Spirit you are of?* May you not as well take upon you, to lay hands on the Sick to heal them? Becauſe of that, *Mark* 16. 18. *They ſhall lay hands on the Sick, and they ſhall recover*: or, *anoint them with Oyl in the Name of the Lord*, becauſe of what you read, *Mark* 6. 13. *Jam.* 5. 14. I dare not *limit* God or his holy Spirit: and I deſire, that you may not *tempt* him. When you have pleaded all you can for the continuance of thoſe *extraordinary gifts*, and for the promiſe of them being *perpetual univerſal* to the whole body,

and *pertaining to us as we are the called of God*, (whereupon it follows, that they ſhould pertain to all that are called of God) yet *experience* will confute you, and prove, they are not ſo *ordinary*. When you make *Prayer and Impoſition of hands, The means ordained of God to obtain thoſe gifts*, (Ser. p. 94. 95.) I might retort ſome of your own words, *Antiq.* 33. *p.* 25. *Shew us what benefit, &c.* And *Antiq.* 39. *pag.* 31. *Name one*— Name one that hath received thoſe gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, by the laying on of your hands. If the *gift of healing, &c.* was ſeen to follow, theſe might draw in more to you then your Writing or Diſputing. And I wiſh you would be adviſed, ere you encourage all your hearers to ſeek for Spiritual gifts, *without any reſtriction*; leſt Women ſeek to Propheſy; or men ſeek *new Revelations*, and ſo turn *Enthuſiaſts*, and think themſelves above Mans teaching.

To which ſee ſomething in my Treatiſe of the Covenants p 430, *&c.* And more in Mr. *Whiſtons Priv. Doct. of Bapt.*

There is enough to be ſaid againſt *your Impoſition of hands*; though I have nothing to ſay againſt *Confirmation*, being duly and orderly performed; but have long wiſht for the Reſtoring

of

of it. So I have nothing againſt *Impoſition of hands*, in ſetting apart perſons that are proved, and fitted to the work of the Miniſtry. But this pertains not to every Member of the Church.

I can paſs by what you ſay of me, that I am *worſe for my Baptiſm in Infancy, as reſting upon that*, &c. *Antiq.* 40. *p.* 32. *Doth not your Conſcience tell you, that the Baptiſm of Men and Women upon profeſſion of faith and repentance, is beyond the reach of contradiction?*] The Baptiſing of ſuch as were without the Church, or were firſt of the *Jewiſh* Church, and to be afterwards admitted into the Chriſtian Church, upon the profeſſion of Faith and Repentance, is plain in Scripture, not to be contradicted. But this contradicteth not the Baptiſing of the Infants of ſuch, being alſo to be acknowledged Church-Members. Neither can you ſhew in all the New-Teſtament one inſtance of any Baptiſed upon their profeſſion, who deferred their Childrens Baptiſm (if Infants) till they were grown up, and able to make the like profeſſion.

But to come a little nearer to you; would you have none but *Men* and *Women* Baptiſed? Then do you not forget your ſelf again? and what you ſaid, *Antiq.* 39. *p.* 31. *Who is againſt as early an engagement of children to God, as can lawfully be made?*] Now this one conceſſion of yours, that you are for *as early an engaging* them to God, *as can lawfully be*, will prove your way *not ſo certain, not altogether clear*, (as you would perſwade your Readers in your *Preface*) not *beyond the reach of contradiction*, but full of doubts, full of difficulties. If the children of Chriſtians are not to be engaged, and devoted to God in their Infancy, you can none of you tell, (how then are you like to agree) *at what age* they are to be ſo engaged, and devoted to God? What think you? Is it not *ſinful* to neglect and put it off, when once it might *lawfully* be done? Now what word, what *Example* can you produce out of Scripture, to ſatisfie Conſcience *how early* you may do it? What was the youngeſt Age that ever any Chriſtians child was Baptiſed at? And if you could tell us the

minimum

minimum quod ſic, and *quod non*, the youngeſt age at which any child was Baptiſed, and under which age none might be Baptiſed, it would be ſome guide to us. Becauſe you put the matter to my Conſcience, I would ſpeak ſeriouſly. And ſo I muſt ſay, was I off from the *grounds of Infant-Baptiſm*, I cannot ſee, how Conſcience would be well ſatisfied about the time of Baptizing my own Children. To defer it after they are come to make a viſible profeſſion, by your own Principles, ſhould be concluded ſinful, againſt the Rule of the Goſpel; but how ſoon a Childs profeſſion may be taken for a ſufficient viſible profeſſion, I ſhould not know how to reſolve, or how to determine.

I have one requeſt to you, that you would take into your more ſerious thoughts that part of the *laſt Query* which you left out. Think how much of it you have granted unto. And let us ſtudy the things that make for Peace, and whereby we may edifie one another.

What you ſeem to hide from your Readers, I ſhall give you the ſubſtance of

of (more briefly) out of Mr. *Baxters Review*, p. 27. "That if you would be "contented your selves, to satisfie "your own Consciences to be Rebap-"tized, (as one that doubted whether "he were well Married, would secure "it, by being Married over again) and "would afterwards live peaceably in "Communion with your Brethren, "and not appropriate Church-Com-"munion to your Sect: And if you "would not deny our Infants part in "the Covenant of Grace, the promise "of Pardon, and life by Christ, and "our Infants Church-Membership, "and only deferred the Baptismal In-"vestiture, as *Tertullian* desired, for "the more solemn Inauguration and "Obligation; Though I should not be "of your mind, I should live in as lov-"ing forbearance and communion "with you, as with other Christians.

The Lord direct all his professing people into the way of Truth, and Peace, so prays

Your Friend

J. B.

After this brief Reply to your Anti-queries, I would propound to you these following Queries out of Mr. *B's* first defence, or *plain Scripture-proof*, &c. desiring your serious thoughts upon them. If you say, they are answered already in Mr. *B's* writings, then it will be more easie for you to return an Answer, which if clear and succinct, may more befriend your cause than greater volumes. Some Queries out of Mr. *Baxters Plain Scripture-Proof for Infant-Baptism.*

Preparatory Enquiries.

1. Is not the Scripture more sparing in such cases as these? *v. p.* 3.

1. In speaking of those to whom it speaks not, as concerning the Heathen, and concerning Infants? 2. In lesser points? 3. In points not then questioned? 4. Does not the New-Testament speak more sparingly of that which is more fully discovered in the old? And is not this the very case here? The main Question not being [By what sign Members are to be admitted into the Church,] or [whether by a sign, or without?] but [At what age they are to be admitted Members?] which is as fully determined in the old Testament, as most things in the Bible; *v. p.* 4.

Bible; and therefore what need any more?

2. Will the difficulty of a point, that it is not ſo eaſie or clear as we would have it, prove, that it is not Truth? *v. p. 5.* The Apoſtle *Peter* tells us many things are hard to be underſtood, even in *Pauls* Epiſtles; yet are they not truths for all that? Are there not many weighty Controverſies more difficult than this? (And ſhould it not be conſidered, whether the contrary hath not far leſs evidence and likelihood of Truth?)

3. If never ſo clear evidence of Truth be produced, will it not ſtill be dark to them that are uncapable of diſcerning it? And is not this the caſe *v. p. 6.* of many, even of the godly, that are but children in knowledge?

4. When the caſe is ſo difficult that we cannot attain to a clearneſs and certainty, muſt we not follow the more probable way? And though there ſhould be far more ſaid againſt *v. p. 125.* Infant-Baptiſm than hath been ſaid; yet if far more may be ſaid againſt your way of Baptiſm, ſhould not this ſtop you?

5. And

5. And is it not a ſpirit of raſhneſs and headineſs, that runs men preſently upon new untried ways, upon every doubting about the old? would not tender Conſciences, who know errors to be dangerous, wait, and pray, and enquire of thoſe that are likely to inform them, &c. before they venture? v. p. 2. v. p. 6.

6. Is the overthrow of a mans former weak grounds, the overthrow of the Truth which he held? Or is the overthrow of other mens weak arguments a weakning of the Truth which they maintain? v. p. 7.

7. Is not one ſound Argument enough to prove any thing true? what if all the Texts that are brought were put by, ſave one, is not that enough?

8. Should not the former and preſent cuſtoms of the holieſt Saints and Churches, be of great weight with humble moderate Chriſtians in caſes controverted, and beyond their reach?

9. Are not evident conſequences, or Arguments drawn by reaſon from Scripture, as true proof, as the very expreſs words of a Text? If it be proved, [that all Church-Members muſt be admitted by Baptiſm.] And then proved, v. p. 8.

[That

[That Infants are Church-Members:] is not this as much, as to prove, They muſt be Baptized? Will you allow of ſuch an Argument for Infant-Baptiſm as Chriſt brought for the Reſurrection? (*Mat.*22.31,32.) or will you call that weak arguing, which is like his?

*v.p.*9,10. 10. Is this Controverſie in it ſelf conſidered, of ſo great moment, as ſome make it? Is it a fundamental point, and duty, of abſolute neceſſity to ſalvation, (why then was not Bap-
*v.p.*244. tiſm in the Creed called the Apoſtles?]
v.p. 11. *Mark.* 16. 16. ſaith only, *He that believeth not is condemned*; not, He that is not Baptiſed. Doth not the Apoſtle ſpeak of Baptizing, as a ſmall part of his work, in compariſon of Preaching, 1 *Cor.* 1.14,17. Though all Chriſts commands, both great and ſmall, muſt be obeyed, ſo far as we know them; yet if Chriſtians make that which is comparatively ſo ſmall a point, a chief part of their ſtudy and conference, and lay out at leaſt one half of their zeal about it, are not ſuch deluded? And if they were in the Truth here, yet is not that Truth a ſnare to them?

v.p. 12. 11. Tho the point of Infant-Baptiſm be

be comparatively of leſs moment; yet whether the grounds on which it ſtands and which are uſually denied with it, be not of great moment?

Now to the Queſtion, [*whether ſome Infants ought not to be Baptized?*]

(1.) Ought not all Chriſts Diſciples ordinarily to be Baptized? (*Mat.* 28. 19. μαθητεύσατε, *make ye Diſciples, Baptizing them,*) And are not ſome Infants Chriſts Diſciples? May not the word [Diſciple] be taken in a larger ſenſe, Relatively; for one that is of the number of thoſe that belong to Chriſt, as Maſter and King of the Church, and devoted to his overſight and rule, and teaching for the future: as well as in a narrower ſenſe, for thoſe who are actual Learners? And *v. p.* 15. *v. p.* 14.

(1.) Doth not the Holy Ghoſt call them Diſciples? *Acts* 15. 10. Is it not evident, that thoſe on *whoſe necks* the falſe Teachers would have *laid the yoke*, were *Diſciples*? If you ſay, not All, but ſome of them are here called *Diſciples*, that is, only them at Age; then will it not follow, that it is but ſome only, whoſe Circumciſion the Apoſtle and the Synod doth conclude againſt, that *v. p.* 15. *v. p.* 16.

is,

is, thoſe of age? Then for any thing the Apoſtle ſaith, or this Synod, all Infants might be circumciſed ſtill: and is not this abſurd?

v. p. 18. 2. If no Infants are Diſciples, what is the cauſe? Is it becauſe they are *not capable?* or becauſe *God will not ſhew them ſuch mercy?* Can you find out a third cauſe, which is not reducible to one of theſe? And 1. If Infants are *capable* of being *ſervants of God*, how can they be thought incapable of being *Diſciples?* If you will make a difference, is not more required to a *Servant*, than to a *Diſciple?*

v. p. 19. Yet is it not plain, that Infants are capable of being Gods Servants? *Lev.* 25. 41, 42. If God call Infants his Servants, though they are uncapable at preſent of doing him Service, what forbids, but that we may call them Diſciples, tho at preſent they are uncapable of learning? Were not the

v. p. 20. *Jews* and their Infants called Gods ſervants in a ſenſe peculiar, as choſen and ſeparated from all others; that the Gentiles at age were not ſo Gods ſervants, as the *Jews* Infants were? Otherwiſe how could it be a reaſon for

for releasing them in the year of Jubilee, any more than for releasing any other?

2. Are not Infants capable of being Subjects of Christs Kingdom? And is not Christs Church both his Kingdom and his School, and every Member of it under him, both as King and Prophet? Are not all Subjects of Christ in his visible Kingdom or (Church) *Christians?* And are not *Disciples* and *Christians* all one in the Language of the Holy Ghost, *Act.* 11. 26. *v. p.* 21.

Again, can it be, that Infants are not Disciples, because God *will not shew them such Mercy?* Were not Infants in the Jewish Church Servants and Disciples of Christ, (tho not so fully, and explicitly as now?) was not Christ then the King of the Church, as Mediator, upon undertaking to pay our debt? And if Infants in the Jews Church were Servants, and Disciples, doth not God shew as great and greater mercy to his Church now under the Gospel? *v. p.* 22.

And to your common objection, that Infants *cannot learn.* (1.) Yet can they not partake of the protection and provision

vision of their Master, and enjoy the
v. p. 23. Priviledges of the Family and School, and be under Christs charge and Dominion? (2.) And be *devoted to Learning*, if they live, and consecrated to him as their Master? (3.) And why should any be more vigorous with Christ in this case, than with Men? Is it not common to call the whole Nation of the *Turks*, both old and young, by the name of *Mahometans*, or *Disciples of Mahomet?* And what if Infants cannot at first learn to know Christ? Is that the first Lesson? Is it not somewhat, if they can be taught any of the duty of a rational creature? And doth not Scripture require to *teach Children* the trade of their life *in the time of their youth*; (as early, no doubt, as they are able to understand) and to bring them up *in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?* And does not this nurture belong to them, as *Schollars of Christ?*

(2.) Ought not all ordinarily to be Baptized, that ought to be *admitted*
v. p. 24. *visible Church-Members?* Since Baptisin was instituted, have we any Precept or Example of admitting visible Members

Members any other way? Will you not grant, that all visible Church-Members must be admitted by Baptism? Now what plentiful proof may be brought, that some Infants ought to be admitted visible Church-Members? And does there need any more to prove, that they ought to be Baptized? *v. p. 26.*

(1.) Whether were not some Infants once to be admitted Members of the visible Church, by the *merciful gift* and *appointment of God*, not yet repealed?

Were not Infants part of them that *entered into Covenant* with the Lord, that he might *stablish them for a people* to himself, and might be to them a God? *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12, 13. And were not Infants engaged to God by the Seal of his Covenant, [*Circumcision?*] If you say, That this merciful gift of God to Infants, and ordinance for their Church-Membership is repealed, does it not lie on you to prove it? yet how will you fail herein; whereas it is easie to prove the contrary? *v. p. 27.*

(1.) If this Ordinance and merciful Gift be repealed and revoked, whether *v. p. 38.*

is it in Mercy, or in Juſtice? whether is it for their good, or for their hurt?

Dare you ſay, that God hath repealed Infants Church-Memberſhip to *their hurt, in juſtice?* Did he ever revoke his Mercies in Juſtice to the parties hurt, till they firſt brake Covenant with him, and ſo procured it by their own deſert? Now, were there not many *Jews* that believed, and did not forſake the Covenant of God? How then could theſe or their Infants, be put out of the Church in juſtice to their hurt?

Or can you ſay, that it is in *Mercy for their good?* How can it be a mercy to take away a mercy, except it be to give a greater mercy inſtead of it? Now, is there any greater mercy given to Infants than *Church-Memberſhip?* Thoſe Infants which were in the Church before Chriſt, had they not God engaged in Covenant to be their God, and to take them for his *peculiar people, Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. And thoſe that were *aliens to the Common-wealth of Iſrael,* were they not *ſtrangers to the covenant of Promiſe, and without hope, and without God in the World, Eph.* 2. 12.

v. p. 99.

v. p. 40.

12. And is there any Scripture that ſpeaketh of delivering any from this ſad eſtate, but Church-Members? And when God *addeth to the Church ſuch as ſhall be ſaved*, can it be any known way of mercy, to be caſt, or put out of the Church? Did Chriſt come in the fleſh to put Infants out of his Church in mercy? Will you ſay, he could more fitly ſave them out of his Church, than in it? And if it be no benefit to the Catholick Church to have Infants kept out of Heaven, nor any hurt to the Church to ſee them there; why ſhould it be a benefit to the whole Church to have them kept out on Earth? or any hurt to the Church to ſee them Members here? And whatſoever it may be to ſtrangers, yet how can it ſeem ſuch a mercy to Parents, to have their Children put out of the Church? why then hath God made ſuch promiſes to Parents for their Seed; as if much of the Parents comfort lay in their Childrens Welfare? And hath God no mercy for Infants? or can he not ſhew mercy to the whole Church in an eaſier way, than by caſting out all their Infants? What great comfort

v. p. 42.

(v. epiſtle to Bewdly, p. 7.)

would follow this concluſion, That all your Infants are out of Chriſts viſible Church? Can you prove, that Chriſt will ſave thoſe that are no Chriſtians? not ſo much as viſibly or ſeemingly
v. p. 43. Subjects of his Kingdom? If ſome priviledges were taken away, as the Releaſe of the *Jews* ſervants, *&c.* yet are there not far greater given in their ſtead?

(2.) Is it not evident from *Rom.* 11. 17. That only *ſome of the Branches were broken off* from the Church: Therefore to the reſt that remained in, the gift
v. p. 44. was not repealed. Doth not the Apoſtle ſay it of that Church, whereof Infants were Members with their Parents, that but ſome were broken off from this Church? (And how far is the whole Church from being diſſolved?) And who can imagine, that God ſhould caſt out the Infant, (that came in for the Parents ſake) while the Parents remain in the ſame Church?

3. Is it not evident from *Rom.* 11. 20. That none of the *Jews* were broken off but *for unbelief?* And conſequently, that Believers and their ſeed were not broken off? Will you ſay, that the Apoſtle

Apoſtle ſpeaketh theſe of the Inviſible Church? Doth he not ſpeak of that Church, whereof the *Jews* were natural Branches, (*v.* 24.) and was not that the Viſible Church? And if the breaking off was viſible, (ſuch wherein Gods ſeverity was to be beheld by the Gentiles, as *v.* 22.) was it not from the Viſible Church *directly?* Could there be a viſible breaking off, or removal from an inviſible term? *v. p.* 45. *v. p.* 46.

(4.) If it be into *their own Olive*, (which they were broke off from, and of which they were *natural branches*) that the *Jews* ſhall be *re-ingraffed* at their recovery; (as *Rom.* 11. 24.) then how is Gods Ordinance for their Infant Church-Membership repealed? Is not their own Olive their own Church? And did not their own Church ever contain Infants, as Members? As it will, when it is but part of the Catholick Church; tho they be not reſtored to the *Moſaical Law*, or Covenant of peculiarity: but taken into the Catholick Church. *v. p.* 48. *v. p.* 49.

(5.) Is it not the ſame Olive, or Church, which the *Jews* were broken *v. p.* 50.

off from, that we *Gentiles* are graffed into, as *Rom.* 11. 17, 19, 24? And if their Church admitted Infant-Members, and ours be the ſame, muſt not ours admit of Infant-Members alſo? Is it not plain from the Text, that the Olive, or Church it ſelf remained ſtill, only ſome Branches were broken off, and others of the Gentiles ingraffed in their ſtead? Then how is it taken down any further than as to ceremonial accidentals?

v. p. 51. (6.) Would not Chriſt have gathered *Jeruſalem*, (which is uſually put for all *Judea*, and the *Jewiſh* Nation?) *Mat.* 23. 37, 38, 39. And is it likely that he would have unchurched all their Infants, when he would have gathered to him whole *Jeruſalem*, or the whole Nation?

v. p. 52. (7.) Can ye ſuppoſe the believing *Jews* children (and ſo the Parents in point of comfort) to be in a worſe condition ſince Chriſt, than they were before? Did Chriſt come to make Believers or their children miſerable, or bring them into a worſe condition?

v. p. 53. And is it not a far worſe condition to be out of the viſible Church, than in it?

Hath

Hath not Christ made larger promises to his Church Visible, than to any in the world that are not of the Church? what promise is there to others, except the conditional upon their coming in?

8. If the Church of Christ be not in a worse state now (in regard of the Childrens happiness, and the Parents comfort) than it was before Christs coming, then will it not follow, that our children ought to be admitted Church-Members, and consequently that Ordinance and merciful Gift is not repealed? *v. p. 55.*

(9.) If the Children of Believers now be put out of the Church, then are they not in a worse condition than the very children of the Gentiles were before the coming of Christ? Is it not the expres Letter of Gods Law, that any stranger that would come in, might bring his children, and all be Circumcised, and admitted Members of the *Jews* Church? *v. p. 56.*

(10.) Was not the Covenant, *Deut.* 29.10,11,12. (which all the *Jews*, with all their little ones, were enter'd into with God) a *Covenant of Grace*, (as distinct from the Laws which was repealed?) *v. p. 57.*

pealed?) How then is it, or their Church-Membership grounded on it repealed? Is not that a Covenant of
v. p. 251. Grace, wherein God taketh them to be his people, and engageth to be their God? Hath God entred into such a Covenant with any since the Fall, but in Christ, and upon terms of Grace? Is not that a Covenant of Grace, wherein the Lord promiseth to *Circumcise their hearts, and the hearts of their Seed, &c.* See *Heb.* 10. 16, 17. And doth not the Apostle *Paul* cite those *words of faith, Rom.* 10. 5, 6, 7, 8. out of this very Covenant? Compare *Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14. with the Text last cited.

v. p. 58. (11.) If Infants then were entred and engaged Church-Members, by that *Circumcision*, which was a *Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, and was not given on Legal grounds, (as *Rom.* 4. 11.) how comes that Church-Membership of Infants to be repealed? Is it any other than a shift, to say, that it was only such a Seal of *Abrahams* righte-
v. p. 59. ousness of Faith? Is not the nature, end, and use of Sacraments, or holy engaging Signs and Seals, the same to all,

all, though the fruit be not alway the ſame?

(12.) If the Law of Infants Church-Memberſhip was no part of the *Ceremonial*, or meerly *Judicial Law*, nor yet of the *Law of Works*, (as ſuch) how can you ſay, that it is repealed, ſeeing no other Laws are repealed? Will you ſay, it was part of the *Law of Works*, which knows no mercy to thoſe who have once offended? Was not Church-memberſhip a mercy? And if it was part of the *Ceremonial Law*, what was it a type of? What is the Anti-type that hath ſucceeded it? And how could this be part of the meerly *Judicial Law*, ſeeing Infants were Church-members long before the time of *Moſes*, when the *Jews* were formed into a Common-wealth, and the Judicial Laws given them? And can you ſay, that this was *proper to the Jews*? Was it given to them only; that is, only to *Iſaac* and his Seed, on whom the *Jewiſh* priviledges were entailed? Were not many hundreds circumciſed as Church-members (and among them many Infants) in *Abrahams* family before *Iſaac* was born; and ſo all the Proſelites (with

v. p. 60.

(with their Infants) afterwards that would come in ?

(13.) Is it not clear, that there is
v. p. 61. an Univerſal Church viſible ? And that every one that is a Member of a particular Church, is alſo a Member of the Univerſal ? And that the *Jews* Infants were Members of the Univerſal ? And that this Univerſal Church is not diſſolved ? Now, muſt not he that will affirm, the whole ſpecies of Infants are caſt out of the Univerſal viſible Church, prove it well ? And ſince we find that they were once in it, what need we any more proof, that they remain in, till it can be ſhewn where it is revoked ? And is it any good conſequence, that is fetcht from the removal of a particular Church, or of the *Jews* particular Church to breaking off from the Univerſal ? If a *Jew* had been forced into a ſtrange Country, yet had not both he and his children there been Members of the Univerſal Church ?

(14.) Is not that falſe Doctrine,
v. p. 70. which makes the children of the Faithful to be in as bad, or a worſe condition, than the *Curſe* [*Deut.* 28. 32,41.] doth make the children of Covenant-breakers

breakers to be in? Is it not ſaid, (*v.*4.) that thoſe that keep the Covenant are *bleſſed in the fruit of their Body*? And of Covenant-breakers, (*v.* 18. 32, 41.) *Curſed ſhalt thou be in the Fruit of thy Body: Thy Sons and thy Daughters ſhall be given to another people: They ſhall go into Captivity?*] Now, is it not a ſorer curſe to be put out of the whole Viſible Church of Chriſt, than to go into Captivity? To be in Captivity is but a Bodily judgment *directly*, but is it not *directly* a Spiritual judgment to be out of the Church?

(15.) Doth not the Doctrine, which puts Infants out of the viſible Church of Chriſt, leave them in the viſible Kingdom of the Devil? Doth not the *World* and the *Church* contain all mankind, according to the ordinary Scripture-diſtribution? If you ſay, Infants may be of the inviſible Church, is not the viſible Church wider than the inviſible; That ordinarily we may not judg any to be of the inviſible Church, who are not of the viſible? *v. p.* 71. *v. p.* 72.

(16.) And will you leave us no ſound grounded hope of the juſtification, or ſalvation of any dying Infants in the world?

v. p. 74. world? Can we have any true ground of Christian hope that they shall be saved, who are not so much as seemingly (or *visibly*) in a state of Salvation, and so die? To judge a thing to be what it doth not any way seem, or appear to be, is it not *likely actually*, but alway *virtually*, and *interpretatively*, a false judgment. And if they that are not of the true Church are not in a state of Salvation, then will it not follow, that they that seem not to be of that Church, do not so much as seem to be in a state of Salvation?

v. p. 82. (17.) What a full plain Text is that, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. Are the children of Believers holy in state? then ought they not to be admitted visible Church-members? Are not all Divines agreed in the definition of the Church, That it is a *Society of persons separated from the world to God?* Will not this Text prove children *holy, by a stated separation to God?* Is not the constant sense of the word [*holy*] a separation to God?

v. p. 83. And were not the Infants of the faithful Church-members, and so holy, before Christs time? And is it not most probable that the Apostle speaks of the

same

ſame kind of holineſs, which was the ordinary priviledge of the faithful before? But utterly improbable that he ſhould ſpeak of no other holineſs here but *legitimation*, (which is common to the children of Pagans?) And if to be *holy* in the Apoſtles ſenſe here, be no more than to be *lawfully begotten*, then may we not call all perſons *holy*, that are not *Baſtards*? Then is not almoſt all the world holy? Becauſe *Baſtards* are called clean, will it therefore follow, that the *legitimate* may be called *holy*? The *Beaſts that chewed the Cud, and had cloven feet*, were *clean*, will you therefore ſay, they were *holy*? v. p. 84.

(18.) When it is ſaid, *Mark* 10. 14. *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*,] whether this be not more, than *they may be viſible Church-Members*? And whether theſe which Chriſt *took up in his Armes, and Bleſſed*, were not Members of his viſible Church? Are any viſibly Bleſt without the viſible Church? And is it not conſiderable, that all the three former Evangeliſts make full mention of theſe paſſages of Chriſt? Is it not evident, that they were taken for Doctrines of moment for the Churches v. p. 105. v. p. 106.

infor-

information? And whether those words of Christ so plain, and earnest, [*suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not*] be not a better Plea at Judgment for our admitting Infants, than any that ever yet you have brought for refusing them? Turn over your Bible, and see if you can find where Christ or his Apostles have said as much against our admitting Infants Church-members, and then consider, which way is safest.

Epistle to Bewdley *pag.* 7.

Now to the *Common Objections.*

v. p. 110. (1.) If these Texts be objected, *Rom.* 9. 8. *They that are the Children of the flesh, these are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise are accounted for the Seed,* Eph. 2. 3. *We are by Nature the Children of Wrath.*] To the first Text, what is it the Apostle mainly drives at, but that Men are not therefore *saved*, because they are *Abraham*'s carnal seed, (and consequently, not because they are the carnal seed of any other?) And is it their certain *Salvation*, or their *Church-Membership*, that we dispute for (in regard

regard of Individuals?) And further, doth the Apoſtle ſpeak one word againſt the priviledge of thoſe Infants, whoſe Parents violated not Gods Covenant, nor fell away? If a man ſhould affirm, That all the Infants of the faithful (ſo dying) are certainly ſaved, is there a ſyllable in the Text againſt him? Were they not *aged unbelievers* that the Apoſtle excludeth here?

And to *Eph.* 2. 3. What though we are *by nature the children of wrath*; Doth it follow, that we may not be otherwiſe by *grace*? Again, may not children be viſible Church-members, and yet perhaps children of wrath too? Were not all the children of Church-members among both *Jews* and *Proſelites* Church-members? And yet were they not *children of wrath by nature*, as we are? *v. p.* 111.

2. If you object, that Infants are not *capable of the ends* of Baptiſm: To this, though Infants are not capable of *every benefit* by Baptiſm, as the Aged are; yet are they not capable of the *principal ends*? May it not be a *liſting ſign* to enter them Church-members, and ſolemnize their Dedication to *v. Preface, p.* 2, 3.

Christ, and engage them to be his people, and to take him for their Lord and Saviour, and so to confer on them remission of sin, and what Christ by the Covenant promiseth to the Baptised; (though yet themselves understand not this; even as we put the names of Infants in Bonds and Leases, which they can neither read nor know of?)

v. p. III. And may it not be operative by its signification as soon as the Child comes to the use of Reason, (which will not be so long as you use to defer Baptism?) And in the mean time, as his interest
v. p. 112. is upon the condition of the Parents faith, and as he is received as it were a Member of them, so may not the Parents have the present actual comfort of it, (as the Parent hath the actual comfort of a Lease that assureth an Estate to his Child?) And was not Christ himself Baptized, when yet he was *not capable* of many of the *great ends of Baptism?* Was Baptism to Christ a sign of the washing away of sin, or of purifying his Soul, (which was perfect before,) or of being buried with Christ, *&c.* And how uncapable were the

the Infants that Christ laid his hands on, and took up in his Armes, of understanding the meaning of what he did? Shall we therefore say, that Christ should have let it alone till afterwards? And will you tell us, what operation Circumcision had on the Infants of Church-members formerly? Was it not a *Seal of the righteousness of Faith?* And yet, had they any more Faith or knowledge of the significancy, than ours have now? Was it not an *engaging sign?* And yet, were not they as uncapable of understanding either the significancy, or engagement, as ours are? So,

(3.) If you object, How can an Infant Covenant with God, or be engaged by this Sign? And where doth God require the Parent to engage his children, &c. To this, if only the Aged are capable of engagement, may you not thence straitway conclude, that no Infant was ever circumcised? But may not that be the Childs Action *Morally*, and in *Law-sence*, which is onely the Fathers Action *Physically?* When a man puts his Childs name in a Lease, and binds himself and his heirs,

v. p. 253.

v. p. 178, 179.

is not the Child thus entred into Covenant and Bond? And does not the Law take *it as his Act*? And is it not a plain natural duty of Parents to covenant for their children, when it is for their good? And doth not the Scripture fully shew, that all the people of *Israel* did (by Gods appointment) enter their children into the Covenant of God? Were they not to circumcise them, which God calleth [*his Covenant*] and [the *sign of the Covenant*?] And is it not as plainly spoken, as the mouth of man can speak it, in *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12, 13. Did not the Parents there enter their children into the Covenant, and not the Infants themselves? And doth not that shew, God hath given Parents their interest and authority?

v. p. 113.

v. p. 250.

4. Another common objection is, if Infants must be *Baptized*, why may they not as well *receive the Lords Supper*? To which, may not the very external nature of the several Sacraments satisfie you? Hath not Christ appointed the first to be such, as Infants are capable of? May not they be washed as well as the Aged? But is not the other such as they are, *naturally*

v. p. 115.

rally incapable of in their first Infancy? And is not the former instituted plainly for *all disciples?* But what Scripture saith, that all Disciples as such, should presently receive the Lords Supper? Is it not restrained to those, that can *first examine* themselves, and can *discern the Lords Body, and keep in remembrance his Death?* And if every Burgess at Age, as such, hath power to Trade, &c. in the City; will it therefore follow, that every Infant may do so, that is born a Burgess? v. p. 243.

(5.) It hath been objected, that if it be the Will of Christ that Infants should be Baptized, it is strange, that he hath left it so dark. To which, will you not grant, that all Church-members must be admitted by Baptism? Is this dark or doubtful? And how many Scriptures are there that prove Infants must be admitted Church-members? Can we say, the Scripture is dark, or sparing in that? Again, The Scripture speaks most fully in the Controversies, which in those times were agitated: but was it any Controversie then, whether Infants were to be Members of the visible Church? Did not the v. p. 115.

v. p. 116. *Jews* take it for unquestionable, all their Infants having actual possession, and that upon Gods own grant and Ordination? Now, if Christ would have dispossessed them, should he not somewhere have discovered it? And would it not have occasioned great disputes and debates? [*v. Epistle to* Bewdley, *p.* 5, 6.]

Further, what if it were more obscure than it is? Is not the New Testament as silent about Christian Kings, or any Christian Magistrates, or about an Oath before a Magistrate, and about War, and about the prohibited degrees of Marriage, and about the Sabbath, *&c.* Will you therefore say, these are not revealed? It it not enough that they are revealed in the Old Testament? And was not Infants Church-membership revealed clearly there?

v. p. 117. (6.) Another objection is, The evil consequences of Infant-Baptism, as gross Ignorance much occasioned by it, *&c.* To which, 1. Is not the Lord Jesus himself the *occasion* of the ruine and damnation of multitudes, (*Luk.* 2. 34.) Had it been better therefore, the

the World had been without him? And is not the Gospel to many, *The Savour of Death unto Death, and to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Gentiles foolishness?* And must the Gospel be blamed for this? What is it that Wicked men will not take hurt by, and make an occasion of their destruction? And have not many said so about the religious Education of children, that it is but the way to make them Hypocrites? point-blank against the Will and Word of God, *Deut.* 6.7. *Prov.* 22. 6. And do not many make their belief of the Scripture, and believing that Christ died and rose again, and that he is the Saviour of the World, and the profession of his Name, to be the ground of their hopes of Salvation, and thousands more, than that trust to their meer Baptism? And what if many amongst you think to be saved, because they are Baptized again? *v. p.* 117, 118.

2. Can you shew (any of you) what there is in the *nature of the thing*, that should be hurtful to any? If a Child that cannot read, be entred into the School, that he may learn to read, is there any thing in this that tends to *v. p.* 118.

deluſion? If a Childs name be put into a Leaſe, is there any thing in this to do him hurt? 3. Was that the reaſon of the deluſion, and groſs ignorance of the *Jews*, that they did not ſtay till they were at Age? Shall we thus make God the deluder, and blinder of the *Jews*, and accuſe his Sacred Laws and Inſtitutions of Errour? If it was an *high favour* to them to be entred in Infancy into the Church and Covenant, how comes it to be an hurt or wrong to us now? 4. Was the caſe of the Proſelites among the *Jews* (being entred at age) ſo much better than the caſe of their own children, and of all the *Jews* and their children? And had
p. p. 119. the *Jews*, Gods own people, leſs mercy than thoſe that were thus adjoyned to them? 5. If all ſhould profeſs their Faith in Chriſt before they were entred, how quickly might the multitude learn *ſuch a profeſſion*, as none of you could reject upon any Scripture-ground? And might it not become cuſtomary, formal, and conſiſtent with great ignorance? And they that will make no conſcience of the ſolemn Promiſe which their Parents made in their names, is it likely

likely that they will make ever the more Conſcience of it, if they had made it firſt in their own names; ſeeing the violation of either will alike forfeit their Salvation? 6. Do not Miniſters indeavour to take men off from ſuch formality and ſelf-deluſions? And let them know, that their meer Baptiſm (whether in Infancy, or at Age) is not ſufficient? 7. What if this were done, that when children come to Age, they muſt all ſolemnly, in the face of the Congregation *perſonally* own, and renew their Covenant? Why may not this engage them, as well as if they were Baptized then? Was every man that was *Baptized at Age* in the Apoſtles times, neceſſarily to profeſs, that he *believed in Chriſt with all his heart*, (which indeed containeth *the ſum of the Covenant*) yet may we not be bound to theſe *disjunctively*, (who by Gods Law are to be Baptized in Infancy) that each duty ſhould be performed, as we are capable of it? 8. Would your way of Baptizing be likely to engage men half ſo ſolemnly, as ſuch a courſe; it being ordinarily in a manner private, and done in ſuch manner, that

v. p. 124.

that persons of modesty will be so taken up with shame, that they will be less serious in the business.

9. If God would have Infants to be Church-members, and so entred by Baptism, are not all these objections against God, and a carping at his way?

v. p. 125. Now (having enquired about the grounds and proofs, and defence of the Church-membership, and Baptism of Infants,) next let us see, whether your practice of *delaying Baptism* have as much warrant in Gods word.

(1.) Where do you find one word of *Precept* or *Example* in all the Bible for deferring the Baptism of the Child of any one Christian till years of discre-

v. p. 126. tion? Should not you bring some Scripture for your way, who require such express proof from us? Now can you shew one word of command or example here? If you cannot, how can you say that yours is the Scripture-way?

(2.) Is not your way inconsistent with obedience to the Rule? Is it not Christs Rule, that persons shall be Baptised without delay, when they are first made Disciples? Doth not this appear in the *Commission*, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. where

where Christ adjoyneth Baptizing immediately to Discipling? And from *constant example* in Scripture, explaining the Commission? Where do we find mention of any one person, that was Baptized long after being discipled? And from the *end and use of Baptism*? Is not this the use of Baptism, to be the sign of their first Covenant with Christ, and solemn admission into the Church? Then is it not to be used at their first Admission? (If any reason of necessity or convenience, cause it to be put off a few days; yet this is not delaying it months and years, (as you do) though indeed there is no warrant in Scripture for any delay at all, but as necessity may excuse it.) Now, though you yield the use of the sign to them when they come to Age, yet what is it but an empty sign, quite beside Christs Institution, and void of the true end of Baptism? for how can it then be the initiating sign to those that have been long in the Church before? If the children of Christians are disciples in their Infancy, then how can you that Baptise them not till they come to Age, (in so doing) Baptise them

v. p. 127.

v. p. 341.

v. p. 128.

them when they are first Disciples? And further, suppose this were not proved, that Infants are Disciples, yet if you cannot know when such children are first discipled (except it be in their Infancy) how can you Baptise them when they are first discipled? Taking discipleship at present in your own sense, and setting aside the consideration of meer Relative Infant-discipleship, how can you know it, since God useth to work such as are born and brought up of Christian Parents to the acknowledgment of Christ by such insensible degrees, that the beginning of their true acknowledgment is ordinarily unperceivable? Again, seeing such do not usually know themselves when they were first disciples (in this sense) how much less can others know it?

v. p. 130. (3.) Would not this practice (of yours) necessarily fill the Church with perpetual contentions, as being about a matter, that cannot be determined by any known Rule? And can that be according to the mind and will of Christ? If the Gospel occasioneth contentions, doth it any more than occasion them? But would not this naturally,

tally, and neceſſarily produce them? And that in the Churches, and amongſt the beſt Miniſters and Chriſtians? When would the Churches or Miniſters ever agree upon it, when their underſtanding, or ſeeming ſeriouſneſs is arrived at that degree, which muſt ſatisfie? Whereas it is eaſily known to all, and can be no controverſie, when a man begins to profeſs himſelf a Diſciple, who was before a Pagan; yet when one is born in the Boſome of the Church, and brought up in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and ſo comes to it by inſenſible degrees, is not the caſe far different? *v. p.* 131. *v. p.* 132.

(4.) When you pretend to ground your practice on *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. from whence you would infer, that none are to be Baptiſed, but thoſe that are firſt made Diſciples by teaching, (though the truth is, that *indirectly*, and *remotely*, the diſcipling of the Parent, is a diſcipling of his ſeed alſo) would not your Doctrine turn Baptiſm, (for the moſt part) out of the Churches of the Saints? According to you, only they that are made diſciples by *Miniſterial teaching directly*, ſhould by this Rule

be

be Baptized, and in a well-ordered godly Church would not these be few, or none? Taking [*Disciple*] in your sense for a Professor of Christianity, hath not God appointed another primary, more ordinary way of making Disciples of the children of the Godly, *viz.* godly education? Hath not God commanded the use of this means to all Parents, that they teach them the Law of God, and bring them up in *the nurture and admonition of the Lord* from their childhood? And may we not conclude, that God appoints no means to be used, from which he will ordinarily withdraw his Grace, or to which he will deny his Blessing, if it be used aright? (though the Word con-
v. p. 290. vert many that have neglected their Parents, or have been neglected by them.) And further, doth not experi-
v. p. 133. ence confirm it, that God frequently blesseth this means? Now, according to you, how many thousands are there that should never be Baptized, because they were not first made Disciples by Teaching, according to the sense of *Mat.* 28. 19. which is Ministerial Teaching?

(5) Your

(5) Your ordinary practice of Baptizing by *Dipping* over head in cold water, (which you use as necessary) is it not a breach of the Sixt Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill.* Being ordinarily and generally used, doth it not tend directly to overthrow peoples health and lives? How vain is it to say, that many are appointed the use of Bathing, as a Remedy against Diseases? Is it an Universal Remedy? yea, how few Diseases have cold Baths appointed them? And how many that have been tenderly brought up, and take but little of the cold Air, that dipping in cold weather in cold water in the course of nature would kill, either presently, or by casting them into some Chronical Disease? Will you say, if it be Gods way, he will prevent the danger, how great soever? But hath God appointed any Ordinance contradictory to his great Moral Commands? Hath he appointed any Ordinance in his Church, which will destroy men, except they be preserved by Miracle? Will you say, he hath tied himself to a constant working of Miracles, (which he hath not done, except

v. p. 134.

v. p. 136.

be Baptized, and in a well-ordered godly Church would not these be few, or none? Taking [*Disciple*] in your sense for a Professor of Christianity, hath not God appointed another primary, more ordinary way of making Disciples of the children of the Godly, *viz.* godly education? Hath not God commanded the use of this means to all Parents, that they teach them the Law of God, and bring them up in *the nurture and admonition of the Lord* from their childhood? And may we not conclude, that God appoints no means to be used, from which he will ordinarily withdraw his Grace, or to which he will deny his Blessing, if it be used aright? (though the Word con-
v. p. 290. vert many that have neglected their Parents, or have been neglected by them.) And further, doth not experi-
v. p. 133. ence confirm it, that God frequently blesseth this means? Now, according to you, how many thousands are there that should never be Baptized, because they were not first made Disciples by Teaching, according to the sense of *Mat.* 28. 19. which is Ministerial Teaching?

(5) Your

(5) Your ordinary practice of Baptizing by *Dipping* over head in cold water, (which you use as necessary) is it not a breach of the Sixt Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill.* Being ordinarily and generally used, doth it not tend directly to overthrow peoples health and lives? How vain is it to say, that many are appointed the use of Bathing, as a Remedy against Diseases? Is it an Universal Remedy? yea, how few Diseases have cold Baths appointed them? And how many that have been tenderly brought up, and take but little of the cold Air, that dipping in cold weather in cold water in the course of nature would kill, either presently, or by casting them into some Chronical Disease? Will you say, if it be Gods way, he will prevent the danger, how great soever? But hath God appointed any Ordinance contradictory to his great Moral Commands? Hath he appointed any Ordinance in his Church, which will destroy men, except they be preserved by Miracle? Will you say, he hath tied himself to a constant working of Miracles, (which he hath not done, except

v. p. 134.

v. p. 136.

cept the Doctrine of *Transubſtantiation* be true?) May we tempt God? And have you duly conſidered what our Saviour ſaith, *Mat.*12.7. *If you had learned what this meaneth, I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltleſs?* —— If in caſe of danger, you ſhould have, and allow of a warm Bath, ſhould not you that are wont to call for expreſs Scripture for Infant-Baptiſm, be required to bring expreſs Scripture for this warm Bath? —— If you ſay, they may ſtay till the heat of Summer, where have you any Scripture for that?

v. p. 135.

Farther, is it yet proved by any of you, that *Dipping* was conſtantly uſed in the Scripture-times. Is it plain, or ſo much as probable, that the Jaylor was dipt over head, who was Baptized in the night in his houſe? And does not the Greek word ſignifie to *Waſh*, as well as to *Dip*? Is it not ſo taken, when applied to other things, as *Mar.* 7.4, 8, *&c.* And is not the *thing ſignified* ſet forth by the phraſe of *Waſhing* or *Sprinkling*? and need the *Sign* exceed the thing ſignified? (See *Iſa.*44.3. *Ezek.* 36.25. *Joel* 2.28. 1 *Cor.* 6.11.

Tit.

Tit. 3. 5. *Heb.* 10. 22. and 12. 24. 1 *Pet.* 1. 2.)? And if it was otherwise, might it not be only *occasional*, from a Reason proper to those hot Countries? Where hath Christ appointed the measure of water, or the manner of washing, any more than he hath appointed in the Lords Supper what quantity of Bread and Wine each must take? May not a little signifie as well as much, as a clod of Earth doth in giving possession of much Lands, *&c.*

(6.) Is it not a breach of the seventh Commandment, [*Thou shalt not commit Adultery*] to Dip persons naked, or next to naked? Doth not the seventh Commandment forbid all inticements to uncleanness, and all immodest actions? And is it not such, to Baptize Women naked, or next to naked? Can that practice be of God, which would turn Gods worship into contempt, and make it ridiculous, and bring a general reproach upon the Christian profession among all the Enemies of it, yea, among the most sober and discreet, and that upon so probable grounds? And to Dip persons cloathed, will it not overthrow

v. p. 136.

v. p. 137.

v. p. 138.

the Argument usually brought for the necessity of washing the whole Body? Though the garment be washed, yet may it not hinder the washing of some parts of the Body?

(7.) (What fruit of these things?)

v. p. 144. How many of you, that instead of labouring after the winning of Souls from sin to God, make it the main scope of your endeavours in publick and private, to propagate your opini-

v. p. 146. ons? How many of you make a great stir, till you have brought poor Souls (which is too easily done) to place their Religion, in being of your opinion here, and being re-baptized? How

v. p. 144. many of you are great hinderers of the Gospel, and of the work of converting Souls, making it your business to bring the Ministers of the Gospel into contempt? Whether may not this be one thing that greatly confirmeth them in their enmity to the Doctrine of the Gospel, and the Preachers thereof, when they hear those despise the Ministry, that once were constant hearers? yea, hear them perswading people that Ministers are Seducers, false Prophets, &c. (As if the first thing

they

they had to learn, was to [illegible] Teachers.) What way could be found out more effectual to make people disregard and despise the Gospel, and so to ruin their own Souls, than thus to teach them to vilifie the Messengers of the Gospel, and perswade them that it is a vertue to reproach and forsake their Guides? And whether the most of you do well, that have made your Doctrine a ground of *separation*? And that perswade people, that it is a sin to hear our pretended Ministers, (as they have been called) because they were never Baptized? If you can make them believe, that the Ministers are Seducers, and that it is a Sin to hear them, what good are they likely to receive by that Ministry? And what a case was the Land in, if all did believe, as some of you teach? And where the Gospel before prospered, and Christians spent their time and conference in the edifying of each others Souls, and in heavenly duties, and lived together in unity and love, (according to the great command of Christ) have not many of you (when you have come) turned this to vain

v. p. 145.

v. p. 146.

janglings, and unprofitable disputes, and turned their Unity into Factions and Divisions, and their Amity into
v. p. 149. Jealousies and Contentions? yea, how many a *distracted* family is there in *England* (upon this account) where one will pray, and the other will not pray with him, because he is unbaptized, who were wont to Worship God in unity?

And here I would have ended. Only there are two or three Queries more which offer themselves, that I commend to your serious consideration.

v. p. 177. Q. 1. Whether it be at all credible that Satan would be so charitable to Believers Infants, as to plead for their priviledges; or would be a propagater of Christs Kingdom, and forward to engage and bring in Subjects and Disciples to him?

v. p. 174. Q. 2. Whereas we tell sinners of the hainous aggravation of their sins, as being committed after Baptism, and after their solemn Vow and Covenant made to God; whether you that make Infant-Baptism a *nullity*, dare undertake to bear the burthen of this Aggravation for them? And whether you may tell sinners (that we do but serve

them, as some serve fooles children, fright them with Bug-bears) that there is no such matter, they were never Baptized, and therefore never sinned against their Baptism: they were never so engaged to God, and therefore never sinned against that engagement? Will you warrant them, that they never need to repent for their sinning against their Baptism, and the Covenant then made? Or will you bear the blame for them?

Q. 3. Whether it should not lie heavy on any tender conscience to add to Gods Word, holding the repeal of the Ordinance of Infants Church-membership, which no Scripture affirmeth; to be guilty of the Churches doleful Divisions, and the great grief that hereby oppresseth the hearts of so many of Gods people; to censure (if not unchurch) all the Churches of Christ since the Apostles times, or almost all——? And all this in contending, that your own children are out of Christs visible Church? How doleful is it, that any Christians should be so zealous to dispute their own children out of Christs Church; and to plead

v. p. 160.

v. p. 161.

that they have no right to be admitted Members, that they are no Disciples of Christ, no Christians?

v. p. 177. And whether they that are zealous in solliciting men not to engage their Children in Covenant with God, may not have as many thanks from Christ, as the Disciples had for keeping such from him?

FINIS.

Books Printed for, and are to be sold by *Tho. Parkhurst* at the Bible and three Crowns in *Cheapside*.

SErmons on the whole Epistle of Saint *Paul* to the *Colossians*, by Mr. *J. Daille*, translated into English by *F. S.* with Dr. *Thomas Goodwins*, and Dr. *John Owens* Epistles Recommendatory.

An Exposition of Christs Temptation on *Matth.* 4. and *Peters* Sermon to *Cornelius*, and circumspect walking. By Dr. *Tho. Taylor.*

Books 4to.

The Door of Salvation opened by the Key of Regeneration, by *George Swinnock*, M. A.

An Antidote against Quakerism, by *Steph. Scandret.*

An Exposition on the five first Chapters of *Ezekiel*, with useful observations thereupon, by *William Greenhil.*

The Gospel-Covenant opened, by *Peter Bulkley.*

Gods holy-Mind touching matters Moral, which he uttered in Ten Commandments: Also, an Exposition on the Lords Prayer, by *Edward Elton*, B. D.

The

The Fiery Jesuit, or an Historical Collection of the rise, encrease, doctrines and deeds of the Jesuits.

Horologiographia optica, Dyaling, universal and particular, speculative and practical; together with a description of the Court of Arts, by a new Method, by *Silvanus Morgan*.

The Practical Divinity of the Papist discovered to be destructive to true Religion, and Mens Souls, by *J. Clarkson*.

The Creatures goodness, as they came out of Gods hand, and the good Mans mercy to the Bruit-creatures, in two Sermons, by *Tho. Hodges*, B. D.

Certain considerations tending to promote Peace and Unity amongst Protestants.

Mediocria, or the most plain and natural apprehensions which the Scripture offers, concerning the great Doctrines of the Christian Religion: of Election, Redemption, the Covenant, the Law and Gospel, and Perfection.

The Morning-Lectures against Popery, or the principal Errours of the Church of *Rome* detected and confuted in a Morning-Lecture, Preached by several Ministers of the Gospel in or near *London*.

Four useful Discourses: (1.) The Art of improving a full and prosperous condition for the

the glory of God; being an [illegible] Art of Contentment, in three Sermons, on *Philip.* 4. 12. (2.) Christian submission, on 1 *Sam.* 3. 18. (3.) Christ a Christians life and death is gain, on *Philip.* 1. 21. (4.) The Gospel of Peace sent to the Sons of Peace, in six Sermons, on *Luke* 10. 5, 6. By *Jeremiah Burroughs.*

A new Copy-Book of all sorts of useful hands.

The Saints Priviledge by dying, by Mr. *Sayr.*

The Unity and Essence of the Catholick Church-visible, by Mr. *Hudson.*

The intercourse of Divine Love between Christ and the Church, or the particular Believing Soul: in several Lectures on the whole second Chapter of *Cant.* by *John Collins*, D.D. Large 8*vo.*

Heart-Treasure: or a Treatise tending to fill and furnish the Head and Heart of every Christian with Soul-enriching-treasure of truths, graces, experiences, and comforts.

The sure mercies of *David*, or a second part of Heart-treasure, by *Oliver Heywood.*

Heaven or Hell here in a Good or Bad Conscience, by *Nath. Vincent.*

Æsop's Fables, with Morals thereupon, in English-Verse.

The Young-Mans Instructor, and the Old-Mans

Remembrancer; being an Explanation of the Assemblies Catechism.

Captives bound in Chains, made free by Christ their Surety; both by *Tho. Doolittle.*

Eighteen Sermons Preached upon several Texts of Scripture, by *William Whitaker.*

Sin the Plague of plagues, or sinful sin the worst of Evils; by *Ralph Venning*, M. A.

Speculum Sherlockianum, or a Looking-glass in which the admirers of Mr. *Sherlock* may behold the Man, as to his Acuracy, Judgment, Orthodoxy.

Small 8*vo.*

A defence against the fear of Death; by *Zach. Crofton.*

Gods Soveraignty displayed; by *W. Gearing.*

The godly mans Ark, or a City of Refuge in the day of his distress, in five Sermons; with Mr. *Moors* evidences for Heaven; by *Ed. Calamy.*

The Almost-Christian discovered, or the false-Professor tried and cast, by *M. Mead.*

In small 12*o.*

The Duty of Parents towards their Children.

A little Book for little Children.

A method and Instruction for the Art of Divine Meditation. All three by *Tho. White.*

The Prisoners Prayers.

FINIS.